

Hoosier Archives was originally a periodic listing of the Diplomacy archives of Walter Buchanan, R. R. #3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, Postal Diplomacy Congress, and V-P/Treas., International Diplomacy Association. It is now primarily a Diplomacy genuine devoted to articles on good play, demonstration games such as the Multiple Winners Invitational (1972CR) now in progress, rating systems and game news. Information from the archives is vital for all this and is available to the public as well. Although the archives is virtually complete in at least xerox form, missing undamaged originals are solicited, either for purchase or a loan to permit xeroxing. (See the last archives listing in Hoosier Archives #53 for aimes needed.) Many original spares are now available from the archives; more are solicited so as to make them available to others. A subscription to Hoosier Archives is 13/\$2.00 or 6/\$1.00; back issues are 15¢ apiece (20% discount for all available). Ask for #87 to get a Hoosier Archives #87. This is Albatross Press publication #95.



### INTO THE ARCHIVES NO. 44

Although Len Lakofka is an expert on tactics, he also knows there is another side of the game called "diplomacy." He adeptly explores that important aspect of the game in the article below. Incidentally, Len came in second in the Grudge Game and qualified for the Diplomacy Winners Invitational (where he is playing Turkey), so he bears listening to!

#### VENDETTA---THAT DIRTY WORD IN DIPLOMACY

by Len Lakofka

While articles of tactics are all well and good (I hope they are, I write about 5% of them), there is a factor in this game that is often left alone--namely, the diplomatic side of the game. Behind that sloppy dog-eared post card, that hasty letter, that 4-page formal letter, or that military manual, there is a flesh and blood person. He loves, hates, and thinks, but not like everybody else! He is unique! It is this factor that you utilize to gain his trust, his respect, or his anger. To treat each player as an address that is pushing some little blocks of wood around a board is folly.

If you have played a number of games, you can spot players from experience or reputation. But if you are new, how do you appraise your adversary (ally)? A good method is, with the first diplomatic letter, to ask him about games he's play(-ing/-ed) in. Once he mentions one--be it boast, banter or begrudging--follow it up! Get a few copies of the sine (Hoosier Archives is just that, an archive and not just a list of his play, his moves and his style. Go as far as to ask other players in other games what they know of him. (Remember to know your source when you accept gossip!)

Now you start to pry into him. Use your normal negotiation style BUT begin to adapt to his!! If you begin to conform a bit to his style, he will open up to you more readily and you can communicate more easily. See if he moves towards your style. If he does not, this can be an indicator that he is stubborn or set in his ways.

A good player is like Len Chaney--he presents "a thousand faces." He can be silly, serious, stupid, succinct, supercilious, sensational, sadistic or sagacious, and each depending on the game's need and the course of the game. The juvenile outburst, the vendetta, the miswritten move and legal lapdog rule are all tools. Each is used depending on the situation. Yet both you and he should have a code-one standard you can ascribe to. It may be the treaty, the verbal promise, or the imperative sentence--but stick to one ray of honesty in negotiation! A player who does not will not last long.

All of this is prelude to the vendetta. It is often seen, but when do you use it? Vendetta is a good tactic to use against a player who has done you dirt in that game. If you do along as good-hearted Joe after you've been stabbed, he'll stab you again later! Therefore, wait till his back's turned and kill, kill, kill!

The other, not so acceptable, reason is simply that you find the person personally repulsive! Don't be so big that you can't say, "I don't like him--in fact, I hate his guts."

Show him how you feel--go after him with teeth bared!

Finally, let's touch on the opening of lines of negotiation. There is a time that is ripe for any situation; a time when a peace feeler (I just love that term, don't you?) is perfect! Even if you have been (or are) at war, you can still talk. Tell him how wrong you've been, threaten him, show him how he can gain (don't say you'll let him gain, etc. I'd give details, but I'm playing in 25 games at the present moment and...you know how it is.

# ARCHIVES ARTICLE LISTING

The following articles have been printed in Russler Archives. From approximately #60 on, almost all the articles are in print (as well as a few before that). The issues in which they appear are available for 15¢ apiece (20% discount for all available), and out-of-print articles can be ordered for 10¢ a page plus 2¢ postage and handling per page.

- |                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| Basham, John    | "An Overly Defensive Strategy Leads to Stagnation," HA #10                                |
| Beyerlein, Doug | "The Art of Puppetry," HA #86   |
|                 | "A Comparison of Rating Systems," HA #74  |
|                 | "A Rating System Philosophy," HA #88  |
|                 | "Rating Systems as I See Them," HA #44  |
|                 | "Tactics: Diplomacy's Forgotten Child," HA #62  |
| Birnan, Ed      | "French Opening Variations," HA #59   |
|                 | "The Larian Cavalot," HA #56  |
|                 | "The Konigsratz Freak-out," HA #64  |
|                 | "The Jutland Gambit," HA #48  |
|                 | "The Levante Opening," HA #43   |
|                 | "Two Statistical Years," HA #45   |
| Brooks, Rick    | "Diplomacy as I See It: The Fool's Mate in Diplomacy," HA #75                             |
|                 | "Diplomacy as I See It: The Mythology of Diplomacy--Part One: Chance," HA #38             |
|                 | "Diplomacy as I See It: The Mythology of Diplomacy--Part Two: The Rating Systems," HA #39 |
|                 | "Diplomacy as I See It: The Variants," HA #49   |
|                 | "Why Not Turkey?" HA #68  |
| Buchanan, Carol | "A Dippy Widow Goes to Youngstown," HA #51  |
| Buchanan, Walt  | "Queen Suzanne in Dippyland," (account of DIPOON V), HA #85                               |
|                 | "Follow the Action: The McCallum System of Notation," HA #54                              |
|                 | "A Russian at DIPOON IV," HA #34  |
| Calhaver, Allan | "On the Play of Postal Diplomacy," HA #17   |
|                 | "The Tactics of Diplomacy," HA #22  |
| Holcombe, Ted   | "Another French Opening," HA #73  |
|                 | "The Holcombe Lane," HA #73   |
| Jarvis, Bill    | "The Perils and Pitfalls of That Grand Old Game, Rulebook FTF Diplomacy," HA #32          |
| Lakofka, Len    | "Basic Tactics of Diplomacy," HA #76  |
|                 | "Four-Player Alliances," HA #84   |
|                 | "French Openings," HA #52   |
|                 | "The Interior," HA #89  |
|                 | "The Organized Diplomacy Player," HA #63  |
|                 | "The Reverse Levante--Who Said It Couldn't Be Done," HA #79                               |
|                 | "Treaties," HA #18  |
|                 | "Turkish Openings," HA #61  |
|                 | "Vendetta--That Dirty Word in Diplomacy," HA #87  |
|                 | "The Viennese Dilemma," HA #67  |
|                 | "The Cherkovsk Fide," HA #72  |
|                 | "An Introduction to One on One Diplomacy," HA #42   |
|                 | "Why Turkey," HA #66  |
| Lamb, Robert    |   |
| Mozik, Steve    |   |

Peery, Larry	"Diplomacy--Introduction to the Strategy and Tactics of Diplomacy," (1 article for each of the 7 major powers) HA #24-26, 28-31
Presnitz, Eugene	"The Subtle Art of Backstabbing," HA #46 "Principles of Alliance," HA #12-13 "Alliance Breaking, Double-Crossing, and the Balance of Power," HA #14 "Correspondence in Postal Play," HA #15
Saythe, John	"A Case for the Triple Alliance," HA #6 "Germany," HA #8
Vagts, Arnold	"Tactical Considerations in Locked Up Positions," HA #40 "You Have a Locked Up Position, so Now What," HA #41
Ver Floeg, Brenten	"Ver Floeg on Germany," HA #20 "Why I Hate Italy," HA #20
von Metake, Conrad	"Black That Metaphor! Stop That Punt!" HA #57 "Forever Isn't the Only Way," HA #80
Walker, Red	"The Arbitrary Nature of So-Called 'Objective' Rating Systems," HA #81 "The Churchill Opening," HA #50 <del>"The Churchill Opening," HA #50</del> "Minority/Survival in Diplomacy," HA #33 "One-Shot Diplomacy," HA #82 "Russia's Northern Offensive," HA #55 "A Short History of the Boardman Numbers," HA #58 "Walker in Koenigsberg," HA #11-12

#### ARCHIVES ARTICLE REVIEW

(With an interesting commentary by Arn Vagts, we would like to initiate this new section in Hoosier Archives. Arn comments on Red Walker's "The Arbitrary Nature of So-Called 'Objective' Rating Systems" as published in issue #81. Arn, by the way, is a very outstanding up-and-coming new player who recently won his first game with that difficult country, Austria.)

Re Hoosier Archives #81 which contains Walker's article on ratings. I was rather disappointed with the article; you see, I agree with him in principle on differential win criteria as opposed to a win-only philosophy, yet except for elaborating on a few points I've made previously (in all fairness he probably hadn't seen my comments as they were just published in Antares #3 although I sent a few personal copies out, one to you) his article is full of errors.

The major blunder Red makes is to lump "zero-sum" with win-only systems. The ODD rating is zero-sum but the BNOB rating is not (neither is it). Zero-sum is completely independent of win-only (e.g., the BNOB rating is zero-sum but not a win-only); zero-sum simply means that the sum of all the points awarded to all the players in a game is zero (hence its name--no big surprise) and has nothing to do with how many points are awarded and how many each player gets. In the BNOB rating, every player gets a chance to receive a positive score while not winning (second place gets 4 points).

Now Red claims zero-sum systems are OK for two player games such as chess but not very good for multi-player games. What he really means (let me be presumptuous and assume Red is rational, or perhaps a little confused) is WIN-ONLY, not zero-sum. You see, the correct extension of the chess rating is to look at all player pairs, NOT just the "winner"-"losers" pairs which ODD does, i.e., ODD is a subset of the proper dimensional expansion of the chess rating. I know this may not be too clear to non-mathematicians, however, I don't want to belabor the point and anyone wanting some examples can read how ODD should (or could) be handled so that points are given for every position in Antares #3 (B. Labelle). Some points are negative so the whole thing turns out to be zero-sum, a feature which is very nice.

Next, no one that I know of, and certainly not John McCallum (ODD), believes his system is "objective" and it is more difficult to justify "magical" points being awarded players in non-zero-sum games. You see, in zero-sum ratings we know where those points come from: the other players. If a player goes up, someone else must go down.

Red points out, and rightly so I believe, that win-only systems suffer from "tunnel

vision" and that ignoring 6/7ths of the relevant data is poor ratingsmanship and no virtue. I was impressed with his analysis of the "if you don't win, you lose" notion as sophistry; I think that was perceptive.

ODD is still the best rating currently out (as explained in my article; I don't want to rehash that) despite its lack of a differential win criteria (which many consider a philosophical question. Calhauer seems to prefer win-only criteria as well as McCallum, so I suppose there must be something there, although I freely admit I don't understand what!). ODD is effective and one can justify it on pragmatic grounds: the computations increase by 250% (15 vs 6 player calculations) for the differential win criteria and 350% (21 vs 6) for country strength considerations. This amounts in total to 6 times as much work as it currently takes. This is OK if a computer is doing the computations but a disaster if done by hand (which I suspect is the case).

#### GRI PRESENTS

The following substantial letters have written during the last 2 months in response to the new GRI flyer and asked that GRI would be passed on to their members with game openings. The numbers indicate the order in which I received each response to the flyer.

50. Tom Grant, R. R. #1, Box 380, St. Paul, Ore. 97137
51. Danny Stafford, 2207 High Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662
52. Craig Chelius, 3343 Tacoma Circle, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104
53. Ronald Zahn, 9664 Hamleton, Detroit, Mich. 48239
54. Jeffrey Carroll, 57 - 1 Maine Street, Travis AFB, Calif. 94535
55. Walter Black, 101 Summit Avenue, Eau Claire, Wis. 54701
56. Robert L. Moore, 3609 Townley Road, Shaker Hts., Ohio 44122
57. William A. Wheeler, Box 371, Shaw Ln., Wash. 98226
58. Mark Edward Rubinstein, 30 Harbor Oak Drive, Apt. #21, Tiburon, Calif. 94920
59. Donald H. Pawley, 151-7 Arnold Drive, West Lafayette, Ind. 47906
60. Mrs. Frank Bank, 336 Hyndman Road, Springfield (Del. Co.), Penn. 19064
61. William T. Ganner, 1053 E. Park Drive, Terre Haute, Ind. 47802
62. CTA3 Stan Frederick, Box 544 U.S. NEGA, FPO New York, New York 09514
63. Mark A. and Wayne S. Rutledge, 1344 Laidlaw Street, Honolulu, Hawaii 96821
64. Patrick Lancaster, Apt. 104, 3440 Carriage Hill Circle, Randallstown, Md. 21133
65. Jon Rush, 4421 Gilbert, #105, Oakland, Calif.

#### THE CALHAUER POINT COUNTRY RATING LIST BY COUNTRY

3,000	Gene Prosnits	1,000	Tom Eller	.450	Edi Birsan
2,000	Mike Goldstein		Allan Huff	.400	Charles Turner
	Monte Zelanny		Dave Johnston	.333	Henry Krigman
1,500	John Koning		Len Lakoffa		Joseph Proskauer
1,333	John Mc Callum		Richard Miller	.250	Frank Clark
	Red Walker		Derek Nelson		Charles Welsh
1,000	Hugh Anderson		Harold Peck	.200	Dave Lebling
	John Beaham		Larry Peury		George Heap
	Doug Beyerlein		Jeff Power		Andy Phillips
	Randy Bytwerk		John Saythe		Jerry White
	Lee Childs		Brenton Vex Floeg	.167	Bruce Coy
	James Dygart		Charles Walls		
		.500	Jeff Wolfe		
			Ken Rosamilia		

INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION: For information on how you can join this rapidly growing service organization (membership now well over 100), write the Acting Membership Secretary, Steve Bell, at 5605 Virgilwood Drive, Greensboro, N.C. 27409.

# THE ARENA POLL OF PLAYER'S ATTITUDES TOWARD VICTORY AND FINISHING

(Edi Birsan, in Arena, is conducting a poll of player's attitudes toward victory and finishing. At last report only 36 responses have come in. In order to make this a large-scale survey, please fill out the questionnaire, if you have not already done so, and mail it to Edi at 48-20 39th Street, Long Island City, New York 11104.)

## I. RANK THE MOST DESIRABLE RESULTS FROM 1 (MOST DESIRABLE) TO 13 (LEAST DESIRABLE):

WIN _____	Two way draw _____	COMMENTS:
Second _____	Three way tie _____	
Third _____	Four way tie _____	
Fourth _____	Five way tie _____	
Fifth _____	Six way tie _____	
Sixth _____	Seven way tie _____	
Seventh _____		

## II. STATE YOUR POSITION ON EACH STATEMENT:

1. If I can not win a game, then the best thing to do is to try to stop the front runner by stalemating the game.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly
2. I will not turn on an ally even if it looks as if he is going to win and I am going to finish second.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly
3. I will not stab an ally even if it looks as if he is going to win and I am going to finish third.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly
4. Once a player has attacked me in a game, I will not ally with him in that game, even if it means letting another player win.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly
5. Most players will try to finish as strongly as possible in a game, even giving up the chance for a stalemated game if it means they can finish second.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly
6. The distance between finishing second and finishing third is the same as finishing fourth and finishing fifth.
  - a. Agree strongly
  - b. Agree somewhat
  - c. Disagree somewhat
  - d. Disagree strongly

## III. CIRCLE THE CORRECT RESPONSE:

Age in years: 12-15/ 16-17/ 18-20/ 21-25/ 26-30/ 31-40/ 41-50/ 50+  
 Years in postal Diplomacy: less than 1/ 1-2/ 3-4/ 5-6/ 7+  
 Years playing Diplomacy: less than 1/ 1-2/ 3-4/ 5-6/ 7+  
 Number of games completed postally: 0/ 1-5/ 6-10/ 11-15/ 16-20/ 21-30/ 31+

COMMENTS: